arXiv:1612.03646v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 12 Dec 2016

Breakdown of the Nagaoka phase at finite doping

Ilya Ivantsov,[1,2] Alvaro Ferraz,[3] and Evgenii Kochetov[1]

[1] *Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia*
[2] *L.V.Kyrensky Institute of Physics, Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, Krasnoyarsk, Russia*
[3] *International Institute of Physics - UFRN, Department of Experimental and Theoretical Physics - UFRN, Natal, Brazil,*

The Nagaoka ($U = \infty$) limit of the Hubbard model on a square lattice is mapped onto the itinerant-localized Kondo model at infinitely strong coupling. Such a model is well suited to perform quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) simulations to compute spin correlation functions. This model is shown to exhibit no short-range ferromagnetic (FM) spin correlations at any doping $\delta \geq 0.01$ and finite temperature, $T = 0.1t$. Our simulations give no indication that there is a tendency towards ferromagnetic ordering in the ground state.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is now widely believed that the essential physics of strongly correlated lattice electrons is encoded in the local constraint of no double electron occupancy. This constraint prohibits double electron occupancy of a lattice site due to the large local Coulomb repulsion between hopping electrons. The on-site Hilbert space is thus restricted to states with at most one electron per site (hard-core fermions). Such a modification of the underlying Hilbert space results in dramatic consequences for the low-energy properties of the relevant electron systems revealing a rich and unusual physics in this limit.

The strong electron correlations are at work to full extent in the Nagaoka ($U = \infty$) limit of the Hubbard model. Indeed, in this case an infinitely strong Coulomb repulsion strictly prohibits the double electron occupancy of the lattice sites, and the no double occupancy (NDO) constraint becomes of the utmost importance. In the infinite U limit, the Hubbard Hamiltonian reduces to

$$H_{U=\infty} = -\sum_{ij,\sigma} t_{ij} \tilde{c}^{\dagger}_{i\sigma} \tilde{c}_{j\sigma}, \quad \tilde{c}^{\dagger}_{i\sigma} = c^{\dagger}_{i\sigma}(1 - n_{i-\sigma}), \quad (1)$$

where t_{ij} is a symmetric matrix whose elements represent the hopping amplitude $t > 0$ between the nearest-neighbour sites and are zero otherwise. Despite its seemingly simple form, this Hamiltonian cannot be diagonalized due to the fact that the projected electron operators $\tilde{c}_{\sigma}$ fulfil complicated commutation relations resulting from the explicit manifestation of strong correlations.

The physics behind the model (1) is certainly far from trivial. Indeed, Nagaoka[1] proved a theorem stating that for one hole the ground state of the $U = \infty$ Hubbard model is a fully saturated ferromagnet. This provides an interesting example of a quantum system in which ferromagnetism appears as a purely kinetic energy effect with hole hoping (itinerant ferromagnetism) emerging as a result of the strong correlations from the NDO constraint.

Unfortunately, despite extensive work over many years, this model and itinerant ferromagnetism are still poorly understood. One of the important questions to be addressed concerns the thermodynamic stability of the Nagaoka phase. That is, whether or not the Nagaoka state is stable when the density of holes is finite in the thermodynamic limit. There are arguments both for[2–8] and against[9–12] the thermodynamic stability of the Nagaoka phase and comparisons between various approaches have been made carefully (for a recent example, see[13]). The basic problem that prevents one from reaching a definite conclusion on that is the large-U limit or, equivalently, the local NDO constraint which is very difficult to deal with in a controlled way.

Analytical approaches basically imply a mean-field (MF) treatment in which the local NDO constraint is uncontrollably replaced by a global condition. For example, the standard slave fermion (SF) MF theory which treats the NDO constraint only on average is known to predict a stable FM phase for the $U = \infty$ Hubbard model over an unphysically large doping range. It was however shown that the SF MF approach produces spurious results and is therefore not reliable for the description of the Nagaoka ferromagnetism.[14]

Available variational approaches[2,4,8,16–19] show that variational estimations that involve more realistic refined trial wave-functions result in a smaller value of the critical hole concentration. In case a mean-field treatment provides an exact result, i.e., in infinite spatial dimensions, the fully polarized FM ground state is never stable.[15] One might therefore think that a proper treatment of the NDO constraint could improve the MF results shifting the critical hole concentrations towards progressively smaller values.

II. MODEL

Numerical studies of the Hubbard model cannot directly incorporate the large-U limit[20]. It should be more useful to construct first an effective Hamiltonian, valid to some order in t/U, to be studied directly by numerical simulations. For large values of the on-site Coulomb repulsion U and a fixed value of the hopping amplitude t, the Hubbard Hamiltonian allows for the expansion in powers of a small parameter $\eta = t/U \ll 1$. The truncated expansion takes the form

$$H_{t-J} = t(H_{hopp} + 4\eta H_{spin} + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2)).$$

The spin-exchange term $H_{spin} = \sum_{ij} \vec{Q}_i \vec{Q}_j$ with $\vec{Q}_i = \sum_{\sigma',\sigma} c^\dagger_{i\sigma'} \vec{\tau}_{\sigma'\sigma} c_{i\sigma}$ being the electron spin operator and $\vec{\tau}$ the Pauli vector. This asymptotic form is refereed to as the $t-J$ model of strongly correlated electrons, with $J = 4t\eta = 4t^2/U$ being the spin-exchange coupling constant. The hopping term, $H_{hopp} = H_{U=\infty}$, appears as a bilinear form of the projected electron operators $\tilde{c}_{i\sigma}$ given by Eq.(1). These operators differ drastically from the conventional fermion operators especially in the most interesting region close to half filling, which poses a serious problem in performing reliable numerical computations.

It is clear that strong correlations are controlled by a small global parameter $J \sim 1/U$. The extreme case of strong correlations – the Nagaoka limit of the Hubbard model – implies $J = 0$. The opposite case of large J formally corresponds to weakly correlated electrons, as it implies $U \ll t$. It is, of course, inappropriate to consider the $t-J$ model at large values of J as a strong coupling limit of the Hubbard model. However one can instead consider the couplings t and J as being *independent* phenomenological parameters althgough they are no longer Hubbard model parameters. This opens up a route to include into consideration a new interesting physics. For example, the phenomenological $t-J$ model displays different types of phase separation depending on the value of J/t. There are at least two physically interesting regimes that are controlled by small parameters t/J and J/t, respectively. In the first case, a hole develops a spin polaron. Within this polaron, the AFM order is suppressed by hole hoping. In the second case, the Nagaoka (FM) polaron is developed, which implies that not only the AFM order is destroyed, but also the FM correlations are developed in the vicinity of a hole.[22].

Strong correlations in the phenomenological $t-J$ model are implemented by the substitution $c_{i\sigma} \to \tilde{c}_{i\sigma}$ that affects only the hopping term. For calculation purposes, it would be desirable to represent such a substitution through a certain interaction between the relevant unconstrained degrees of freedom. This provides an extra parameter to control the strength of the correlations. This can be achieved by employing the earlier established mapping of the $t-J$ model of strongly correlated electrons onto the itinerant-localized Kondo-Heisenberg model at a dominantly large Kondo coupling, λ[23]. Such a model provides a convenient new set of the unconstrained localized and itinerant coordinates well suited for numerical simulations.

Right at the point $\lambda = +\infty$ the proposed Kondo-Heisenberg model is equivalent to the standard $t-J$ model of strongly correlated electrons. Away from that point, the Kondo-Heisenberg model describes a phenomenological $t-J$ model in which the strength of the correlation is controlled by λ.

Specifically, the $U = \infty$ Hubbard model (1) is equivalent to the lattice Kondo model at infinitely strong coupling, $\lambda \gg t$:[23]



FIG. 1. The energy difference $\Delta E = E(Q_{max}-1) - E(Q_{max})$ between the states with $Q = Q_{max}$ and $Q = Q_{max} - 1$ for the different numbers of holes n_h. The lattice size $N = L \times L$ and the doping level $\delta = n_h/L^2$.

$$H_{U=\infty} = \sum_{ij\sigma} 2t_{ij} d^\dagger_{i\sigma} d_{j\sigma} + \lambda \sum_i (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i + \frac{3}{4} n^d_i). \quad (2)$$

Here the localized electron is represented by the lattice spin operator $\vec{S} \in su(2)$ whereas the itinerant doped hole (dopon) is described by a conventional fermionic mode, $d_{i\sigma}$, with $\vec{s}_i = \sum_{\sigma',\sigma} d^\dagger_{i\sigma'} \vec{\tau}_{\sigma'\sigma} d_{i\sigma}$ being the dopon spin operator. The electron spin operator $\vec{Q}_i = \vec{S}_i + \vec{s}_i$. Note that at $\lambda = 0$ the model (2) reduces to a trivial one describing uncorrelated electrons. At $\lambda = +\infty$ the spin-dopon model (2) is equivalent to the Nagaoka Hamiltonian (1). At finite λ, Eq. (2) represents a phenomenological Hamiltonian describing a system of the hopping electrons with doubly occupied states being separated from the rest of the spectrum by the energy $\lambda > 0$. In the present work, we restrict ourselves with the conventional Nagaoka model ($U = \infty$ Hubbard model) in the spin-dopon representation (2). In the Appendix, we briefly comment on a derivation of the Nagaoka theorem in this representation.

III. SMALL-CLUSTER EXACT DIAGONALIZATION

To get some insight into what kind of magnetic order one might expect at finite doping, we start by the exact diagonalization of the finite lattice clusters. The size of the Hamiltonian matrix to be diagonalized is $3^N \times 3^N$, where N is the number of sites. This makes a diagonalization difficult even at $N \sim 20$. However the Hamiltonian is a block-diagonal matrix, where each block corresponds to a given number of electrons and a total spin



FIG. 2. The spin value in the ground state for the different numbers of electrons $n_e = N - n_h$. Periodic boundary conditions are imposed.

projection. Let us first restrict a number of holes to that of $n_h = 1, 2$ and fix the total spin projection to be $Q_z = Q_{max}, Q_{max} - 1$. In Figure 1, we report the results on the exact diagonalization of finite clusters with a maximal size up to 12×12 sites. The upper curve corresponds to the case of $n_h = 1$ and it displays the difference between a fully polarized state and a state with one spin flipped, $\Delta E = E(Q_{max} - 1) - E(Q_{max})$. In case of one hole our results agree with Nagaoka's theorem, which predicts that a fully polarized state is the ground state. The lower curve displays the same quantity for the case of $n_h = 2$. In case of two holes the energy of a fully polarized state lies higher than that of a state one spin flipped. Such a behaviour of the energy levels shows that the fully polarized state is not a ground state for two holes. In other words, the Nagaoka state with two holes is unstable which agrees with results published elsewhere.[24]

We further proceed by computing the lowest energy as a function of various hole numbers n_h and total spin projections Q_{ground} for different clusters with the size up to 4×4. The obtained results presented in Fig.2 show that a fully polarized FM state is a ground state only if there is one hole in a lattice. For more than one hole, a fully polarized state is never a ground state. Our results coincide exactly with those obtained by other methods.[25]

On the other hand, for hard-core spinful bosons, the ground state appears as a fully polarized state at any number of holes. This agrees[26] with the statement exactly proven elsewhere that, for spinful bosons, the hard-core ferromagnetism is stable for *all* hole densities.[27]

Another interesting issue to address concerns the character of a possible associated quantum phase transition. Let us assume that there is a thermodynamically stable fully polarized state at finite doping in the region of $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_{cr}$. Is then a leading instability of this phase continuous to imply that it occurs gradually, through small $\Delta Q = 1$ changes in the total spin? Or instead, such



FIG. 3. The $\langle Q_i^z Q_{i+1}^z \rangle$ correlation between nearest sites for the different numbers of electrons $n_e = N - n_h$. Periodic boundary conditions are imposed.

a transition is discontinuous, meaning a large abrupt change in the total spin $\Delta Q \gg 1$? The results of the exact diagonalization of the small clusters displayed in Fig.2 indicate that a transition from the Nagaoka state to that with two holes always occurs through an abrupt spin change that increases with the lattice size. In particular, the results presented in the Panel (a) tell us that $\Delta Q = 2$, whereas those for the Panel (d) indicate that $\Delta Q = 7$. This therefore seems to indicate at first sight that the breakdown of the Nagaoka phase at $T = 0$ is of a discontinuous type. However, the "oscillation" character of the curves displayed in Fig. 2 show that, at larger number of holes, $n_h > 2$, there are in fact transitions with $\Delta Q = 1$ or even $\Delta Q = 0$. It is not therefore clear what type of transitions actually survives in the thermodynamic limit. In any event, the finite cluster calculations displayed in Fig.2 do not support the statement that the destruction of the Nagaoka state is necessarily accompanied by an abrupt change of the total spin.

The exact small-cluster diagonalization can also be used to compute the spin-spin correlations $\langle Q_i^z Q_{i+1}^z \rangle$ between nearest-neighbour sites. Figure 3 shows these correlations computed on the same clusters as those depicted in the Fig.2. In the hard-core boson case, the correlation functions are purely ferromagnetic and scale as n_e^2. This clearly corresponds to the fully polarized states. For the hard-core fermions, however, the correlations do not reveal any FM magnetic order except for the one-hole case, where the correlations coincide with those in the hard-core boson case. In the fermionic case, a sort of AFM order builds up instead, with a magnitude of the correlations decreasing with the total lattice size. In the next section, we confirm this result by QMC calculations for larger lattice clusters.

IV. QUANTUM MONTE CARLO CALCULATIONS

An alternative approach is based on a computation of spin-spin correlation functions by employing the QMC algorithm. In this way, one can estimate a magnetic correlation length in the asymptotic regime, $r \gg a$. In case this quantity shows no appreciable dependence on finite-size effects, one may draw certain reliable conclusions on a character of the underlying magnetic order.

One must however take a proper care of the fact that we are dealing with a strong-coupling problem. Namely, since we are interested in the large λ limit, it seems appropriate to separate the Hamiltonian (2) in the following way: $H_{U=\infty} = H_0 + H_{int}$, where the leading term is now

$$H_0 = \lambda \sum_i (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i + \frac{3}{4} n_i^d),$$

and the "interaction" term is

$$H_{int} = 2t \sum_{ij\sigma} d_{i\sigma}^\dagger d_{j\sigma}, \quad t/\lambda \ll 1.$$

To compute the spin correlators we adopt the continuous time worldline (CTWL) QMC algorithm based on the representation of the partition function in the interaction picture:

$$e^{-\beta H_{U=\infty}} = e^{-\beta H_0} T_\tau (exp(-\int_0^\beta H_{int}(\tau) d\tau)), \qquad (3)$$

where T_τ stands for the τ-ordering operator, and the partition function $Z_{U=\infty} = tre^{-\beta H_{U=\infty}}$. All the necessary details for the CTWL QMC algorithm to be applied to treat the lattice Kondo-Heisenberg model can be found in a recent paper published elsewhere.[28] The numerical simulations exposed in that work are simply to be restricted to the case of $J = 0$.

The spin-spin correlation function $g(r)$ for the physical electron operators is calculated for a fixed number of dopons, δ:

$$g(r) = \frac{4}{\Delta(r)} \sum_{ij} \langle (S_i^z + s_i^z)(S_j^z + s_j^z) \rangle \bar{\delta}(r - |\mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{R}_j|), \qquad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{R}_i$ is radius-vector of the site i, $\Delta(r) = \sum_{ij} \bar{\delta}(r - |\mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{R}_j|)$ and

$$\bar{\delta}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |x| \le 0.5a, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad (5)$$

with a being the lattice constant and $\langle ... \rangle$ means an average over the spin configurations generated in the QMC run. The corelation function is normalized by the condition $g(r = 0; \delta = 0) = 1$. All numerical results are obtained for a 20×20 lattice cluster with periodic boundary conditions.



a)



b)



c) g(r) at δ=0.01 and T=0.1t. The lattice size is *LxL*.

FIG. 4. Panel (a) shows correlation functions for $L = 10$ for different doping levels for the hard-core boson case at $T = 0.1t$. Panel (b) shows the same for fermion case. Solid (dashed) lines show results obtained for $L = 20$ ($L = 10$), respectively. Number of lattice size is $N = L \times L$. Panel (c) shows the highlighted fragments of panel (b) with the doping level being separately presented .

Figure 4 displays the spin-spin correlators for the hard-core bosons (Panel (a)) and the hard-core fermions (Panels (b) and (c)). In the boson case, the FM order is clearly observed in a full accordance with the exact result[26]. The small-cluster exact diagonalization results displayed in Fig.3. clearly show that the correlation function scales at $T = 0$ as n_e^2. This implies that $g(r) \approx 1$ at $\delta \ll 1$. Finite-temperature effects considerably suppress the correlation function as seen in Fig.4. However, it remains finite, $g(r) \approx 0.2$, $r \gg a$. The observed order in hard-core bosons case is of course not a true long-range order that does not exist in $2D$ at finite temperature but rather a quasi long-range one. The associated FM correlation length is finite but much larger than a cluster size. In fact it scales exponentially with $1/T$ as $T \ll t$.

Panel (b) displays the fermion spin correlators for the different doping levels. In sharp contrast to the hard-boson case, there is no tendency towards FM ordering at finite doping. The spin-spin correlations in real space show no evidence of even short-range FM correlations, but rather weak AF correlations.[29] In case there indeed were a continuous phase transition at a critical doping δ_c at which a true long-range FM order in a ground state in $2D$ does emerge, then, in the associated quantum critical region specified in particular by the requirements $\delta = \delta_c$, $T << t$, the system would necessarily have displayed a finite FM spin-spin correlation length that scales as $T^{-1/z}$ where $z \geq 1$ is a dynamic exponent. This exponent parametrizes the relative scaling of space and time. The precise value of z could have been guessed provided an appropriate effective action to describe the low-energy physics of the $U = \infty$ Hubbard model would have been available, which however is not the case. Just to get an idea as to what might be the order of magnitude of the spin-spin correlation length away from the critical point, let us assume that $z = 1$ (In Fermi-liquid-like systems this would imply that there are no overdamped modes associated with an ordering field[31]). In this case $\xi_{FM} \propto \lambda_T$, where the de Broglie wavelength at finite temperature $\lambda_T = v/T$. This relation implies that thermal and quantum fluctuations are equally important in this (critical) regime. The characteristic velocity of the quasiparticle low-energy excitations $v \propto ta$. At a given temperature, $T = 0.1t$, we therefore get $\xi_{FM} \propto 10a$. In other words, the long-range magnetic order in the ground state would have manifested itself at finite temperature through a finite correlation length of order at least a few lattice spacings. We however never observe the spin-spin correlation functions that display such a behaviour down to a very small doping level of $\delta = 0.01$.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the lack of a clear sign of FM short-range spin correlations in the parameter range studied in our work provides strong arguments against thermodynamic stability of the Nagaoka phase at least for the hole concentrations $\delta \geq 0.01$ It is very likely to conclude that the critical hole concentration is in fact equal to zero. This is a quite natural conclusion as the only parameter in the Nagaoka problem (1) is an overall dimensional coupling constant, t. Varying it simply amounts to changing a scale of units of measuring energy. The critical hole concentration cannot depend on such a rescaling. Since there are no other dimensionful parameters in the problem, there are actually only two acceptable options in the thermodynamic limit, namely, either the FM order does not exist at all, which is the case for the hard-core fermions, or it is realized at all possible hole densities. This last (unphysical) option corresponds to implementing the hard-core bosonic statistics for the constituent particles.

VI. APPENDIX

In the Appendix, we provide a derivation of the Nagaoka theorem within a framework of the spin-dopon representation. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the case of a D-dimensional hypercubic regular lattice. In this case the sign of t is irrelevant so that we can fix the Hamiltonian to be

$$H_{U=\infty} = -2t \sum_{ij\sigma} d^\dagger_{i\sigma} d_{j\sigma} + \frac{3\lambda}{4} \sum_{i\sigma} d^\dagger_{i\sigma} d_{i\sigma} + \lambda \sum_i \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i, \quad t > 0. \quad (6)$$

The limit $\lambda \to \infty$ reduces the on-site Hilbert space to that comprising a spin-up state $|\uparrow\rangle_i = |\uparrow 0\rangle_i$, a spin-down state $|\uparrow\rangle_i = |\uparrow 0\rangle_i$ and a vacancy state $|0\rangle_i = \frac{|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_i - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_i}{\sqrt{2}}$. We should therefore consider

$$H = -2t \sum_{ij\sigma} d^\dagger_{i\sigma} d_{j\sigma} \quad (7)$$

in the reduced Hilbert space.

We define the basis one-vacancy states as

$$|i, \{\sigma\}\rangle = |\sigma_1 \sigma_2 ... 0_i ... \sigma_N\rangle,$$

where $\sigma_k = \uparrow\downarrow$ and $\{\sigma\}$ is a multi-index describing an arbitrary set of the lattice spins. The vacancy state $|0\rangle_i$ is a total spin singlet defined above.

Let

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{(i,\{\sigma\})} \psi_{(i,\sigma)} |i, \{\sigma\}\rangle$$

be an arbitrary one-hole normalized state. Let us define a state $|\Phi\rangle$ with $Q = Q_{max} = Q^z = (N-1)/2$ as

$$|\Phi\rangle = \sum_i \phi_i |i, \{\uparrow\}\rangle. \quad (8)$$

Here $\vec{Q} = \sum_i (\vec{S}_i + \vec{s}_i)$ is a vector of the total spin of the electrons, $\phi_i = (\sum_\sigma |\psi_{i,\sigma}|^2)^{1/2}$, and the multi-index $\{\uparrow\}$

represents that all the lattice spins point upwards. The energy of the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is evaluated to be

$$\langle\Psi|H|\Psi\rangle = -t\sum_{ij,\sigma\tau}\bar{\psi}_{i\tau}\psi_{j,\sigma} \geq -t\sum_{ij}\bar{\phi}_j\phi_i$$
$$\geq -t\sum_{ij}|\phi_i|^2 = -tz, \qquad (9)$$

where z is a coordination number. To obtain (9) we have repeatedly used the Schwartz inequality.[21] From (8) it follows that the energy of the ground state

$$E_{gr} = -tz.$$

The last inequality in (9) is saturated for the state (8) provided $\phi_i = const = 1/\sqrt{N}$. Such a state describes the fully polarized lattice spins and a hole with the highest mobility. This indicates that the fully polarized ferromagnetic state

$$|\Phi_{gr}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_i |i,\{\uparrow\}\rangle$$

is indeed the ground state of the system. This state has $Q = Q^z = (N-1)/2$.

Now it is left to show that there is no another state with $E = -tz$ and $Q < Q_{max}$. Let us denote the state with $E = -tz$ and arbitrary given $N_\uparrow$ and $N_\downarrow$ by

$$|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{(i\{\sigma\})}\psi(i\sigma)|i,\{\sigma\}\rangle.$$

The Schrödinger equation

$$H|\Phi\rangle = -tz|\Phi\rangle$$

then gives

$$\psi(i\sigma) = z^{-1}\sum_{j\tau=n[i\sigma]}\psi(j\tau). \qquad (10)$$

Here $n[i\sigma]$ denotes nearest neighbours of $(i\sigma)$. The unique solution to (10) reads[1]

$$\psi(i\sigma) = const. \qquad (11)$$

This again corresponds to the state with $Q = Q_{max}$ and $Q_z = (N-1)/2$, so that there is no state with $E = -tz$ and $Q < Q_{max}$.

[1] Y. Nagaoka, Phys. Rev. **147**, 392 (1966).
[2] P.Richmond and G. Rickayzen, J. Phys. C **2**, 528, (1969).
[3] J.A. Riera and A.P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 5285 (1989).
[4] M.W. Long, in *The Hubbard Model, recent results*, ed. by M. Rasetti, World Scientific, (1991).
[5] H. Yokoyama and H. Shiba, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **56**, 3670 (1987); D. Dzierzava and R. Frésard, Z. Phys. B **91**, 245 (1993).
[6] E. Müller-Hartmann, Th. Hanisch and R. Hirsh, Physica B **186-188**, 834 (1993).
[7] E.G. Goryachev and D.V. Kuznetsov, JETP Lett. **56**, 203 (1992).
[8] F. Becca, S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3396, (2001).
[9] A. Suto, Commun. Math. Phys. **140**, 43 (1991).
[10] G.S. Tian, Phys. Rev. B **44** 4444 (1991); J. Phys A **24**, 2375 (1991).
[11] W.O. Putikka, M.U. Luchini, M. Ogata, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2288 (1992).
[12] H.Tasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **99**, 489 (1998).
[13] Hyowon Park, K. Haule, C.A. Marianetti, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 035107 (2008).
[14] F. Braghin, A. Ferraz, and E. Kochetov, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 115109 (2008).
[15] P. Fazekas, B. Menge, and E. Müller-Hartmann, Z. Phys. B **78**, 69 (1990).
[16] B.S. Shastry, H.R. Krishnamurthy, and P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 2375 (1990).
[17] W. von der Linden, D. Edwards, J. Phys. Cond Mat. **3**, 4917 (1991),
[18] A.G. Basile *et al*, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 4842 (1990).
[19] Th. Hanisch, G. S. Uhrig, and E. Muller-Hartmann, Phys. Rev. B **56**, (1997).
[20] D.J. Scalapino et al, Phys. Scr. T **27**, 101 (1989).
[21] H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 9192 (1989).
[22] E. Eisenberg, R. Berkovits, D. Huse, and B.L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 134437-1 (2002); M.M. Maska, M. Mierzejewski, E.A. Kochetov, L. Vidmar, J. Bonca, O.P. Sushkov, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 245113 (2012.)
[23] A. Ferraz, E. Kochetov, and B. Uchoa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 069701 (2007); R.C. Pepino, A. Ferraz, and E. Kochetov, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 035130 (2008).
[24] B. Doucot and X.G.Wen, Phys. Rev. B. **40**, 2719 (1989).
[25] M. Takahashi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **51**, 3475 (1982).
[26] A. Fledderjohann, A. Langari, E. Müller-Hartmann, and K.-H. Mütter, Eur. Phys. J. B **43**, 471 (2005).
[27] The hard-core boson model is given by Eq.(1) in which the hard-core fermion operators $\tilde{c}_{i\sigma}$ are replaced with the hard-core boson ones, $b_{i\sigma}$, $\sum_\sigma b^\dagger_{i\sigma}b_{i\sigma} \leq 1$.
[28] I. Ivantsov, A. Ferraz, and E. Kochetov, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 235118 (2016).
[29] Within the QMC simulations of the $2D$ Hubbard model, no indication of ferromagnetism was also found at $U = 8t$, $\delta = 0.35$ and $T = 0.3t$ on a 6×6 square lattice in[30].
[30] J.E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 4403 (1985).
[31] John A. Hertz, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 1165 (1976).